

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9-11 are presently pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 were rejected. Claims 10 and 11 were objected to but indicated as allowable. Assignee appreciates Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Yoshioka, Inoue, in view of Uchida. Claims 1 and 5 are amended to recite, among other limitations "continuously writing a matrix of decoded luminance pixels to a first portion of the memory; continuously writing a first matrix of decoded chrominance pixels to a second portion of the memory; continuously writing a second matrix of decoded chrominance pixels to a third portion of the memory; and the first portion, second portion, and third portion being contiguous".

Examiner has indicated that Yoshioka is silent in regards to explicit of, 'writing a matrix of luminance pixels to a first portion of the memory; writing a first matrix of chrominance pixels to a second portion of the memory, writing a second matrix of chrominance pixels to a third portion of the memory, and the first portion second portion, and third portion being contiguous." Office Action at 3.

However, Examiner has indicated that Inoue teaches the foregoing at col. 11, lines 39-47 and Figure 1C. Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection. It is noted that Figure 1C does not show writing a matrix to memory. "Fig. 1C (prior art) is a *data stream* diagram which illustrates a sequence in which decoded image data is provided in by an MPEG decoder". Assignee respectfully submits that merely

because the blocks are continuous in the data stream does not mean that they are stored continuously in the memory. Indeed, it is entirely possible to provide data that is stored in non-contiguous memory in a contiguous bitstream.

With regards to col. 11, lines 39-47 that describes Figures 7, it is noted that in Figure 7, Y pixels are interleaved with UV pixels. Thus, Assignee respectfully submits that Inoue does not teach continuously writing blocks/matrix as recited in claims 1, 3, 5, and 7.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 11 are rewritten in independent form and it is respectfully submitted that these claims are now allowable.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that each of the pending claims are allowable and Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: October 2, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100